



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,350	07/09/2001	Rajeev Chawla	24631.710	5351
7590	05/24/2005			EXAMINER PICH, PONNOREAY
BRAIN R COLEMAN PERKINS COLE LLP P O BOX 2168 MENLO PARK, CA 95026			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/901,350

Applicant(s)

CHAWLA ET AL.

Examiner

Ponnoreay Pich

Art Unit

2135

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24,26-36 and 51-66 is/are pending in the application. *cancelled*
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23, 25 and 37-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24,26-36 and 51-66 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 24 and 51 were amended. Claims 1-23, 25, and 37-50 were cancelled.

Claims 59-66 were newly added. Claims 24, 26-36, and 51-66 have been examined and are pending. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action. The previous office action is incorporated by reference in its entirety.

Docketing

Please note that the application has been redocketed to a different examiner.

Please refer all future communications regarding this application to the examiner of record using the information supplied in the final section of the office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant filed arguments on 5/9/05 stated additional remarks can be found in arguments filed 4/6/2005. The examiner assumes that the argument filed on 4/6/2005 was the same one dated 4/11/2005 in the examiner's docket. In the argument filed 4/11/2005, applicant argued that the Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide (NPSA) does not disclose determining if the requested content is a static content and securely storing that static content at the SRP using an encryption key that is only known to the SRP. Applicant also argues that Bellwood and Maruyama does not disclose this limitation and that the dependent claims should be allowable in light of the new amendments to the independent claims. The examiner notes, however, that the amendments are still obvious in light of common knowledge in the art. Web caches that only store static content are known, so determining if a requested content is static is

known. Storing a requested (static) content in an encrypted form at a proxy server, using an encryption key known only the proxy server is also known. Reasons for doing the above include faster serving of web content if static content are cached, more space for static content in a cache if only the static content is cached, and greater security for the static content if only the proxy server knows the encryption key.

The examiner assumes that any limitation not argued by the applicant, the applicant agrees that the previous office action shows the prior art(s) used meet those limitations. As such, the examiner will only address new issues brought about by amendments and new claims. See new rejections below.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has noted the amendments filed by the applicant on 4/11/2005 with respect to claims 24 and 51. The examiner also notes the new claims added in the amendment filed. See rejections of new issues and new claims below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24, 26-36, and 61-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. As per claim 24, a limitation recites, "encrypting the requested content, if the requested content is static, using a third secure session protocol...." It is unclear

if the encrypting is done if the requested content is static or if the requested content is static, using a third secure session protocol. The examiner assumes applicant meant, "encrypting the requested content; if the requested content is static, using a third secure session protocol...."

2. As per claim 24, the last limitation recites sending the static content to the at least one web server. It makes no sense to send the content to a web server from the proxy since the server already contains the content. The examiner believes that applicant meant to recite, "web browser" instead of "web server".
3. As per claim 26, a limitation recites, "encrypting the content, if the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol...." It is unclear if the encrypting is done if the content is the static content or if the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol. The examiner assumes applicant meant, "encrypting the content; if the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol...."
4. As per claim 61, applicant recited:
 - a. Encrypting the content at the proxy server using the second secure session protocol.
 - b. Sending the encrypted content from the proxy server to the client using the second secure session
 - c. Receiving the encrypted content at the client using the second secure session.

- d. Decrypting the encrypted content at the client using the second secure session protocol.

The examiner notes that it was established earlier that the session between the client and the proxy server is a first secure session and was established using a first secure session protocol and the session between the proxy server and the web server is the second secure session, using a second secure session protocol. It is unclear how later the second secure session can be between the client and the proxy server using a second secure session protocol. In the above-recited limitations, the examiner assumes the applicant meant "first secure session" wherever it states "second secure session".

5. As per claim 64, a limitation recites "encrypting the second part of the content, if the second part of the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol...." It is unclear if the encrypting is done if the second part of the content is the static content or if the second part of the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol. The examiner assumes applicant meant, "encrypting the second part of the content; if the second part of the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol...."
6. As per claim 64, applicant recited:
 - a. Encrypting the first and second parts of the content at the proxy server using the second secure session protocol.
 - b. Sending the encrypted first and second parts of the content from the proxy server to the client using the second secure session.

- c. Receiving the encrypted first and second parts of the content at the client using the second secure session.
- d. Decrypting the encrypted second and first parts of the content at the client using the second secure session.

The examiner notes that it was established earlier that the session between the client and the proxy server is a first secure session and was established using a first secure session protocol and the session between the proxy server and the web server is the second secure session, using a second secure session protocol. It is unclear how later the second secure session can be between the client and the proxy server using a second secure session protocol. In the above-recited limitations, the examiner assumes the applicant meant "first secure session" wherever it states "second secure session".

7. Any claims not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24, 26-36, 61-62, and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide (herein referred to as

Art Unit: 2135

NPSA) in view of Challenger et al (US 6,216,212) and further in view of Bellwood et al (WO 01/03398).

Claim 24:

As per claim 24, a previous office action has addressed many of the limitations already. The examiner will only address new issues raised due to applicant's amendments.

As per claim 24, a previous office action showed that NPSA discloses encrypting the requested content using a third secure session protocol for storing the encrypted requested content locally in a memory at the at least one SRP (Ch 14, pages 1 and 2). NPSA also discloses sending the content to the at least one web browsers (Fig 7.4 and Ch 7, Proxy as a Stand-in for a Server, paragraphs 1 and 2).

NPSA does not explicitly disclose:

1. Determining if the requested content is a static content.
2. *If the requested content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol for storing the encrypted requested content locally in a memory at the at least one SRP, wherein the third secure session protocol is known only to the at least one SRP.*
3. Decrypting the static content from the memory at the at least one SRP upon subsequent requests for the static content.
4. Sending the static content to the at least one web browser.

However, Challenger discloses that at the time the applicant's invention was made, most proxy caches do not store dynamic web pages (col 2, lines 6-7). This implies that most proxies only store static content in cache and at some point, the proxy checks to determine if the requested content is static or not to determine whether to store the content in cache. Challenger discloses that one of ordinary skill would be motivated to do the above as there is no way to determine if pages in the caches are obsolete (col 2, lines 4-6). The examiner also asserts that a proxy cache only storing static content is obvious even without Challenger's teachings of only store static content in a cache as there is no point in storing non-static content since every time the non-static content is requested, the proxy would have to contact the server for the most recent non-static content anyway. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to just store the static content as it would save space in the cache to not store non-static content.

As mentioned already, a previous office action already established that NPSA showed the requested content being encrypted and stored in local memory of the SRP. Taken in light with Challenger's teaching of only storing requested content that is static content, it would have been obvious to only encrypt and store in memory the requested content if the requested content is static content. Further, the limitation of wherein the third secure session protocol is known only to the at least one SRP was formerly the limitation of claim 25 before that claim was cancelled. A previous office action showed that the limitation was met by Bellwood on page 3, lines 31-36. The previous office action disclosed that one of ordinary skill would be motivated to incorporate Bellwood's

Art Unit: 2135

teachings because a third secure session unknown to the server allows for a more secure communication. The examiner also notes that as the static content is cached by the proxy, having the third secure protocol known only to the proxy server makes the content more secure as the fewer who knows a secret key or protocol, the more secure it is. As the applicant did not argue Bellwood meeting this limitation and the motivation for meeting this limitation, the examiner assumes applicant agrees Bellwood renders the limitation obvious and that the motivation given by the previous examiner for incorporating Bellwood's teaching is valid. As it is the static content that is stored in cache, the last limitation of sending the static content to the at least one web browser is also rendered obvious in light of Challenger's teachings.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made in light of the above teachings of Challenger and Bellwood to have modified NPSA's teachings to arrive at the limitations as recited in claim 24. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate Challenger and Bellwood's teachings for the reasons given above.

Claims 26-36:

The limitations of claims 26-36 were addressed in a previous office action already. The rejections for them stand as the claims were not amended and the applicant did not argue the rejections except for them being depended on claim 24, which was amended.

Claim 61:

The examiner would like to note that claim 61 contains many limitations that are substantially similar in nature to claim 23, which applicant did not argue the prior art of the previous office action meeting the limitations. NPSA discloses a method for caching secure content over a network comprising:

1. Establishing a first secure session between a client and a proxy server using a first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
2. Encrypting a request for content at the client using the first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
3. Sending the encrypted request for the content from the client to the proxy server using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
4. Receiving the encrypted request for content at the proxy server using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
5. Decrypting the encrypted request for content at the proxy server using the first secure protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
6. Determining that the content is not available at the proxy server (Ch 9, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 9.1).
7. Establishing a second secure session between the proxy server and a web server using a second secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
8. Encrypting the request for content using the second secure session protocol at the proxy server (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).

9. Spending the encrypted request for content from the proxy server to the web server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
10. Receiving the encrypted request for content at the web server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
11. Decrypting the encrypted request for content at the web server using the second secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
12. Encrypting the content using a third secure session protocol at the proxy server for storing the content locally at a memory at the proxy server (Ch 14, pages 1 and 2).
13. Encrypting the content at the web server using the second session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
14. Sending the encrypted content from the web server to the proxy server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
15. Receiving the encrypted content at the proxy server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
16. Decrypting the encrypted content at the proxy server using the second secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
17. Encrypting the content at the proxy server using the first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
18. Sending the encrypted content from the proxy server to the client using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).

19. Receiving the encrypted content at the client using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
20. Decrypting the encrypted content at the client using the first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
21. Decrypting the static content at the proxy server using the third secure session protocol when an additional request for the static content is sent from the client to the proxy server (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).

NPSA does not explicitly disclose:

1. Determining if the content is a static content at the proxy server.
2. *If the content is the static content*, using a third secure session protocol at the proxy server for storing the static content locally in a memory at the proxy server, wherein the third secure session protocol is known only to the proxy server.
3. Decrypting the *static* content at the proxy server using the third secure session protocol when an additional request for the *static* content is sent from the client to the proxy server.

However, Challenger discloses that at the time the applicant's invention was made, most proxy caches do not store dynamic web pages (col 2, lines 6-7). This implies that most proxies only store static content in cache and at some point, the proxy checks to determine if the requested content is static or not to determine whether to store the content in cache. Challenger discloses that one of ordinary skill would be

motivated to do the above as there is no way to determine if pages in the caches are obsolete (col 2, lines 4-6). The examiner also asserts that a proxy cache only storing static content is obvious even without Challenger's teachings of only store static content in a cache as there is no point in storing non-static content since every time the non-static content is requested, the proxy would have to contact the server for the most recent non-static content anyway. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to just store the static content as it would save space in the cache to not store non-static content. As only static content are stored in cache, it is further obvious that only static content is decrypted at the proxy server using the third secure session protocol when an additional request is sent from the client to the proxy server.

Finally, the limitation of wherein the third secure session protocol is known only to the proxy server is met by Bellwood (p3, lines 31-36). Note that this was a similar limitation for cancelled claim 25, which applicant did not argue Bellwood meeting, so the examiner assumes applicant agrees Bellwood meets the recited limitation. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate Bellwood's teachings because a third secure session unknown to the server allows for a more secure communication. The examiner also notes that as the static content is cached by the proxy, having the third secure protocol known only to the proxy server makes the content more secure as the fewer who knows a secret key or protocol, the more secure it is.

In light of the above disclosures, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified NPSA's teachings according to the limitations recited in claim 61. One of ordinary skill would

have been motivated to incorporate Challenger and Bellwood's teachings for the reasons given above.

Claim 62:

NPSA discloses wherein a plurality of clients are each securely connected to the proxy server and the proxy server is securely connected to the web server via the second secure session protocol in order to retrieve secure content requested by the plurality of clients that is not contained at the proxy server (Ch 7, Fig 7.4 and Proxy as Stan-in for a Server, paragraphs 1 and 2). NPSA does not explicitly disclose the plurality of clients connected to the proxy server via a plurality of differing secure session protocols. However, the examiner asserts that it is obvious the plurality of clients must be connected to the proxy server via a plurality of differing secure session protocols as there are many different types of clients known in the art of computing and each type of client implements different protocols to connect to a server (i.e. some use SSL, HTTPS, or TSL). One of ordinary skill would have been motivate to allow for a server which can be connected to by different clients via a plurality of differing secure session protocols as any business which runs a proxy server would want to be able to support as many client protocols as possible since the more client protocols it can support with the proxy server, the less the amount of load on the actual server. The business would also be motivated because if they are able to support the client's protocol, the more likely different types of customers are to use the services provided by their proxy and server.

Claim 64:

The examiner would like to note that claim 64 contains many limitations that are substantially similar in nature to claim 23, which applicant did not argue the prior art of the previous office action meeting the limitations. NPSA discloses a method for caching secure content over a network comprising:

1. Establishing a first secure session between a client and a proxy server using a first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
2. Sending an encrypted request for content from the client to the proxy server using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
3. Receiving the encrypted request for content at the proxy server using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
4. Decrypting the encrypted request for content at the proxy server using the first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
5. Determining that that a first part of the content is available at the proxy server and a second part is not available at the proxy server (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4). Note that this limitation is obvious because a webpage often consist of both dynamic and static content, therefore when a request for a webpage is made, the proxy would have to determine which part of the web page is static and cached at the proxy server and which isn't cached. The part that is dynamic or out-of-date and not cached would have to be obtained from the actual web/data server.

6. Establishing a second secure session between the proxy server and a web server using a second secure session protocol to retrieve the second part of the content (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
7. Encrypting a second request for the second part of the content using the second secure session protocol at the proxy server (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
8. Sending the encrypted second request for the second part of the content from the proxy server to the web server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
9. Receiving the encrypted second request for the second part of the content at the web server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
10. Decrypting the encrypted second request for the second part of the content at the web server using the second secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
11. Encrypting the second part of the content at the web server using the second secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
12. Sending the encrypted second part of the content from the web server to the proxy server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
13. Receiving the encrypted second part of the content at the proxy server using the second secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).

14. Decrypting the encrypted second part of the content at the proxy server using the second secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
15. Encrypting the second part of the content using a third secure session protocol at the proxy server for storing the content locally at a memory at the proxy server (Ch 14, pages 1 and 2).
16. Decrypting the first part of the content at the proxy server using the third session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
17. Encrypting the first and second parts of the content at the proxy server using the first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
18. Sending the encrypted first and second parts of the content from the proxy server to the client using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
19. Receiving the encrypted first and second parts of the content at the client using the first secure session (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
20. Decrypting the encrypted second and first parts of the content at the client using the first secure session protocol (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).
21. Decrypting the first and second parts of the content at the proxy server using the third secure session protocol when an additional request for the first and second parts of the content is sent from the client to the proxy server (Ch 7, pages 1 and 2 and Fig 7.4).

NPSA does not explicitly disclose:

1. Determining if the second part of the content is a static content at the proxy server.
2. *If the second part of the content is the static content, using a third secure session protocol at the proxy server for storing the static content locally in a memory at the proxy server, wherein the third secure session protocol is known only to the proxy server.*

However, Challenger discloses that at the time the applicant's invention was made, most proxy caches do not store dynamic web pages (col 2, lines 6-7). This implies that most proxies only store static content in cache and at some point, the proxy checks to determine if the requested content is static or not to determine whether to store the content in cache. Challenger discloses that one of ordinary skill would be motivated to do the above as there is no way to determine if pages in the caches are obsolete (col 2, lines 4-6). The examiner also asserts that a proxy cache only storing static content is obvious even without Challenger's teachings of only store static content in a cache as there is no point in storing non-static content since every time the non-static content is requested, the proxy would have to contact the server for the most recent non-static content anyway. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to just store the static content as it would save space in the cache to not store non-static content. As only static content are stored in cache, it is further obvious that only static content is decrypted at the proxy server using the third secure session protocol when an additional request is sent from the client to the proxy server.

Finally, the limitation of wherein the third secures session protocol is known only to the proxy server is met by Bellwood (p3, lines 31-36). Note that this was a similar limitation for cancelled claim 25, which applicant did not argue Bellwood meeting, so the examiner assumes applicant agrees Bellwood meets the recited limitation. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate Bellwood's teachings because a third secure session unknown to the server allows for a more secure communication. The examiner also notes that as the static content is cached by the proxy, having the third secure protocol known only to the proxy server makes the content more secure as the fewer who knows a secret key or protocol, the more secure it is.

In light of the above disclosures, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified NPSA's teachings according to the limitations recited in claim 64. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate Challenger and Bellwood's teachings for the reasons given above.

Claim 65:

Claim 65 is substantially similar to claim 62 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide (herein referred to as NPSA) in view of Maruyama et al (US 2002/0015497) and further in view of Challenger et al (US 6,216,212).

Claim 51:

As per claim 51, a previous office action has disclosed NPSA and Maruyama meeting most of the limitations of claim 51 already. The previous office action does not explicitly disclose NPSA and Maruyama meeting the new issues brought about by applicant's amendments. These new issues are that the SRP is for caching secure *static* content and the one or more keys are used for encrypting the *static* content before storing the *static* content.

However, Challenger discloses that at the time the applicant's invention was made, most proxy caches do not store dynamic web pages (col 2, lines 6-7). This implies that most proxies only store static content in cache. The examiner also asserts that a proxy cache only storing static content is obvious even without Challenger's teachings of only store static content in a cache as there is no point in storing non-static content since every time the non-static content is requested, the proxy would have to contact the server for the most recent non-static content anyway. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to just store the static content as it would save space in the cache to not store non-static content. Therefore, at the time the applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in light of Challenger's teachings, to modify NPSA and Maruyama's combination SRP appliance according to the limitations as recited in claim 51. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate Challenger's teachings for the same reasons given in claim 24.

Claims 52-55 and 58:

A previous office action discloses how the limitations of claims 52-55 and 58 were met by NPSA and Maruyama. As applicant did not argue the rejections, of claims 52-55 and 58 over NPSA and Maruyama, the examiner assumes the previous office action's rejections are valid and the rejections stand.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide (herein referred to as NPSA) in view of Maruyama et al (US 2002/0015497) and Bellwood (WO 01/03398) and further in view of Challenger et al (US 6,216,212).

Claims 56-57:

A previous office action discloses how the limitations of claims 56-57 were met by NPSA, Maruyama, and Bellwood. As applicant did not argue the rejections, of claims 56-57 over NPSA, Maruyama, and Bellwood, the examiner assumes the previous office action's rejections are valid and the rejections stand.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide (herein referred to as NPSA) in view of Maruyama et al (US 2002/0015497) and further in view of Challenger et al (US 6,216,212) and applicant's admittance of prior art.

Claim 59:

As per claim 59, NPSA, Maruyama, and Challenger do not explicitly disclose wherein the static content is a banner or a navigation button. However, applicant admitted on page 2, lines 9-10 of the specification that examples of static content include banners and navigation buttons. Therefore, by definition, banners and navigation buttons are static contents.

Claims 60, 63, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide (herein referred to as NPSA) in view of Challenger et al (US 6,216,212) and Bellwood et al (WO 01/03398) and further in view of applicant's admittance of prior art.

Claims 60, 63, and 66:

As per claims 60, 63, and 66, NPSA, Challenger, and Bellwood do not explicitly disclose wherein the static content is a banner or a navigation button. However, applicant admitted on page 2, lines 9-10 of the specification that examples of static content include banners and navigation buttons. Therefore, by definition, banners and navigation buttons are static contents.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ponnoreay Pich whose telephone number is 571-272-7962. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PP



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100